DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 801 LI 004 154

TITLE	On Line; [Summary of the Events and Activities of the ADP Conference (4th, Berkeley Springs, West Virginia, October 17-20, 1972)].
INSTITUTION	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. Office of Management Systems.
PUB DATE	Dec 72
NOTE	96p.; (0 References)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Conference Reports; *Electronic Data Processing; Federal Programs; Planning; Project Applications; Standards; Telecommunication
IDENTIFIERS	*Department of Health Education and Welfare; HEW

ABSTRACT

A new approach was instituted for the fourth Automatic Data Processing Conference of the U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Agency personnel were interviewed prior to the Conference to establish questions and issues that the meeting ought to address. An objective opinion was sought from Organizational Development Associates, a contractor, on how best to structure the Conference. An agenda was distributed prior to the Conference; a summary of which is included as an appendix. Considering the agenda and structure of the Conference, "Track Reports" provide the most concise summary of the goals, issues, unresolved questions, recommendations, and needed actions developed at the Conference. The Track Reports (planning, telecommunications, standards, procurement and applications) form the basis of these proceedings. The keynote address, comments at the final session, roster of participants, and an assessment are added to complete the report. (Author/SJ)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

OS
VI

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

ED 072801

ON LINE

LI 004 154

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS
DECEMBER

"On-Line" is published by:

The Office of Management Systems
Room 4300
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
330 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201

Dear Reader:

This is a summary of the events and activities of the Annual ADP Conference, held at Coolfont in Berkeley Springs, West Virginia, from October 17-20, 1972.

It is important to continue the work begun at the Conference. One way you can help is to react to these proceedings: add, delete, clarify, simplify, etc.

Your reaction is awaited.

E A Diephaus

Edward A. Diephaus
Director, Office of Management Systems

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	KEYNOTE ADDRESS	2
III.	TRACK REPORTS	24
	A. Planning	24
	B. Telecommunications	31
	C. Standards	35
	D. Procurement	39
	E. Applications	48
IV.	SUMMARY SESSION	52
V.	ASSESSMENT	74
VI.	ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS	79
	APPENDIX - AGENDA SUMMARY	83

I. INTRODUCTION

This fourth ADP Conference began a little different. Agency personnel were interviewed prior to the Conference to establish questions and issues that the meeting ought to address. An objective opinion was sought from Organizational Development Associates, a contractor, on how best to structure the Conference. An agenda was distributed prior to the Conference; a summary of which is included as an appendix.

Considering the agenda and structure of the Conference, "Track Reports" provide the most concise summary of the goals, issues, unresolved questions, recommendations, and needed actions developed at the Conference. The Track Reports then form the basis of these proceedings. The keynote address, comments at the final session, roster of participants, and an assessment are added to complete the report.

II. KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Presented by Thomas S. McFee, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Management Planning & Technology.

"THE ROLE OF OMS"

I've been looking forward to the opportunity to get back to this group. As I came in tonight I met a number of people who heard my comments a year ago at Ocean City and, I see you had nerve enough to come back to hear me again. I thank you for that. I do not plan to run off in the morning as I did at Ocean City, but am going to spend tomorrow with you. There are a lot of you that I know already and there are a lot of you that I want to get to know. I would be very happy to roam around tomorrow and listen to a number of the sessions that you have planned. So please don't be bashful; come up and tell me what's on your mind. In spite of my reputation with my own staff, I do listen to advice. I very seldom follow it, but I do listen.

I came to HEW from the Defense Department and I learned there from a gentleman by the name of McNamara that I should always be open to suggestions. I am reminded of a comment he made to a military officer once, who had just made some comments about a speech that he had given.

"General what you consider objective observation, I consider rank insubordination." I'll try to be more objective about your suggestions.

It is always difficult to talk after a social hour and dinner. At Ocean City, I tried to deliver my "maiden policy address" and I had only had the job of running the Office of Management Systems a few days at the time. I tried to share with you at that time, some of the ideas that I wanted to try to implement. Now I have had the job for a year, I am older, I am wiser, and I swear that I am shorter than when I took the job. Maybe some of you didn't know that I was six foot-four when I arrived in HEW.

I have nevertheless, had an exciting year. I have learned an awful lot and I think we have progressed a long way, but we haven't gotten all of the problems solved by any means. As I told you a year ago, I think the challenge that we have ahead of us is one of the greatest in all the information systems area. In fact, I am going to go back Thursday evening and address the local Chapter of ACM. Now I deliberately picked the time when all the HEW ACM members would be down here, so that I could go back and talk to all of the other ACM members

about what HEW is doing. In the ACM talk, I make the point that in the management of the social programs not only at the Federal level, but at the State and local levels and even the private sector in the areas of health, education, and welfare, we are moving more and more to what we call "social accountability." We are anticipating the application of techniques and ideas pioneered in the hardware-side of weapons and aerospace systems. We have reached the point in the social side of the government where no longer just throwing money at a problem is going to be acceptable. We are asking the very hard questions: what difference does it make? what impact is it having? is it doing any good? It is not just the "budget crunch" that has brought this on, but rather that the general public is at a point where it no longer accepts simply throwing money at a problem, but is looking for results and accountability. You who are parents and are active in local school systems will notice that accountability in education is a word now being used over and over again. Also, quality of health delivery is at the forefront. Now, all this introduction indicates that to really measure our impact on social problems we need information and good ADP

management to get the maximum out of our systems. This is the forefront of the challenge I think all of us face.

Now, we have horrendous management problems within HEW. It is what makes some run away, it is what makes some of us stay because we find it a challenging and exciting. I have a story to share with you tonight about how bad off HEW really is. I've been told this is a true story, told by someone no longer with HEW but who spent some time with industry in California. At the beginning of this administration, he wrote the President offering his services to HEW. In three months he had not heard from Washington. One day a high-level HEW official was visiting California so he told him of the story. This HEW official offered him a job on the spot, hired him, transported him and so he went to work in HEW. Three months later he got a letter postmarked Washington forwarded to him from his California business address. The letter thanked him for his application but said he wasn't qualified for any jobs in HEW. Well, the story doesn't end there for when he read further he discovered he had actually signed the letter for HEW. Now that might not be an information systems problem,

but it nevertheless is a management problem in something as complex and as large as HEW.

Last year I picked my own subject. I think the subject assigned me tonight -- the role of the Office of Management Systems -- is a very relevant subject. I am probably the best to speak to this subject as I am accountable and responsible for that office.

I appreciate the cooperation you have given our contractor on setting-up this conference. The interviews held, your inputs, your suggestions on subjects, have all been very helpful. I think we are going to have a very good conference. The problems and frustrations you individually and collectively share are also our frustrations and problems. As we examined all of your questions, comments, and suggestions for the conference agenda, we found the thing that came through most was the question of how did the Office of Management Systems perceive of its role.

The kind of support you gave OMS and your suggestions on how we could improve, are going to be very helpful the next year. I found some of the comments in the summary document quite amusing: I am sure that you weren't serious about OMS being out-to-lunch! I have been checking

carefully the length of their lunch hours since! In preparation for tonight, I reviewed last year's speech. Let me briefly tell you what was said: I set the stage by telling you of the creation of the new office I head that put together the Office of Management Systems, the Operational Planning Staff and the Program and Information Statistics activities. I can tell you now at the end of a year that it was a good move; the inter-relationship of these three areas are very close and we have been able to bring the insight of each of these groups to some of the major problems of information systems, management and planning.

Next I mentioned the proposed Department of Human Resources because of the concepts present; particularly for internal management. I told you it might not pass right away, but that Secretary Richardson was dedicated to moving in the direction of decentralized management with effective and supportive information systems. We haven't moved much further on the Department of Human Resources as new legislation, but I have seen through the year the institutionalizing and the strengthening of those support mechanisms that the Secretary will need for the new department. I talked about the role of management

of ADP resources in the new Department of Human Resources and how an office with very strong central direction and planning responsibilities in ADP was planned.

I also predicted what the impact of all of this would be on various information systems activities in the Department and ended the speech with discussion on how the ADP plan would fit into all of this. I think it is important that we ended on that subject. The relationship between the role of the Office of Management Systems and the ADP planning cycle is very close. In fact, they are inseparable. I hope that when I finish tonight you also will see the relationship. Although there are a lot of things that we are going to talk about during the conference, and the ADP planning cycle is only one of these, I think that you will agree with me, that if we really can put together and run an effective ADP planning cycle, fitting in all of the other related activities which are now carried on independently, we will have made a real significant advance in overall planning and management in the Department.

I'd like to start with telling you why there is an Office of Management Systems. Ed is waiting for this part. In getting ready for tonight I reviewed 8 OMB Circulars,

1 OMB Bulletin, 35 GSA Procurement Regulations, 12 GSA Bulletins, 1 GSA Manual, 1 GSA Brochure, a Presidential Directive and Public Law 89-306. These are all documents which assign certain responsibilities to the Secretary that have been delegated to the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management. These are part of the necessary regulations and directives that have imposed on the Department to insure effective, and efficient ADP management. Now most all of these particular circulars and documents are familiar to you, but let me mention a couple of them just so that you will keep them in mind while you are at this conference.

There are some very significant responsibilities given to the Heads of Agencies under A-71 that require agency-wide planning, coordination and control of equipment utilization. I am not going to spend the time to read all of it, but it tells us that we are to do cost-benefit analyses on overall systems applications, to develop data systems that use the newest and most advanced techniques, to merge and integrate data systems irrespective of organizational lines when cost-effective, determine ADP equipment requirements, sharing equipment and services, the determine impact of ADP on work and

productivity improvement, and participate in government-wide studies.

Each of the OMB Circulars assign some kind of responsibility for centralized management planning of ADP resources. There are all of the GSA Procurement Regulations which, in some way, impact upon the role of OMS. There is even a Presidential Directive, still in force although signed back in 1966 by a gentleman whose name I forget right now, which says, "I want the Head of every Federal Agency to use the computer to do a better job and manage the computer activity at the lowest possible cost." Also, in case some of you haven't read the Brooks Bill recently, its overall purpose was, "to provide for economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment." There are some responsibilities in BOB Circular A-61 that were specifically given to the Secretary and re-delegated to the Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management, to assure that operating agency programs are in accord with all of these other directives and guidelines. The Assistant Secretary for Administration and Management is to provide a stimulus to systems planning which transcends across organizatinal lines and permits the integration with systems of other agencies

both external and inside HEW. He is to establish priorities in the systems planning effort, and he is to foster and coordinate equipment sharing.

Now I took the time to briefly relate these to you because these things describe the mission of OMS. It is OMS, as the principle agent of the Secretary, to see that all of these things get done-not do them, but to see that they all get done. Therefore, the role of OMS is defined by the approach we take to get the job done.

We have an approach to that mission and our approach is very clear. We have tried to articulate it, but sometimes people don't believe us. In any organization that is the size of HEW, it would be impossible for one OS central organization away from the programs, away from the problems of the agencies, to do all of this themselves. And so, our objective has been to build an effective planning and management capability for ADP in the individual agencies. This is why I consider the planning process so very important in achieving this objective. I said the process and not the plan. The plan to me is only evidence that there is planning and good management present in the agency. We hope in the

next year to do a better job of integrating most of the ad hoc requests that we now make on the agencies related to, if not part of, the planning process. You know these well: A-83, the 2068 Clearance with GSA, Part 8-15 and Part 16 clearance or data systems, all of the GSA policies and procedures and probably last, but maybe even most important, the overall budget submission which has to be made to OMB each year. I also see A-44, the new combined Management Improvement Report, being built into this plan, so that we won't have a separate call for all of the good things that you've done in the areas of ADP.

My approach and the role of OMS therefore, should be clear to build effective planning into the Agencies, making the planning cycle itself and the plan that it produces, the focal point of overall management improvement in the ADP area.

Last year I closed my talk with my view of the ADP plan. I apologize tonight to those of you that are not primarily concerned with the development of the ADP plan for spending this amount of time on the ADP plan. It was clear to me, as I looked through the contractor's collection of comments, that it was the role of OMS that was of most

concern to you. If how we operate and how we relate to your agencies, indeed the way we develop and manage the ADP planning process is fundamental to the OMS role, then this amount of time on the plan is not wasted.

To refresh your memory, these are the things I said a year ago about the plan. I said I viewed the plan as a tool; a tool to accomplish something and not an end in itself. I was much more concerned about the process that went on in the Agencies, talking to people, gathering of requirements, looking at problems, and the trade-offs than I was with the actual product that came out.

I urged you to relate the ADP plan to the program and the mission of your agency and stressed the fact that if we had to make decisions on the use of ADP resources, they should not be looked at, unrelated to the overall objectives and the mission of the agency. In other words we wanted the plan to be realistic, we did not want it to be an inventory or a wish list, but a plan that fits into the overall agency operational plan.

We wanted one plan from each agency, not a stapling together of everybody's ideas, but a central focus in each agency, putting together a plan at the agency level

making the hard decisions that are necessary and can be made only at that level. We wanted a plan to reflect the agency heads' priorities and be his plan, not the plan of some ADP planning office buried two or three levels below the Agency Head.

We wanted the plan to establish objectives for the utilization of resources, so that we and the agency could monitor the implementation of that plan to see whether you were achieving the objectives.

We wanted this plan to cover at all levels within an agency, not just the top-management level, but to permeate down through the Bureaus and Divisions. We wanted the ADP plan to become a foundation upon which we could take future action, so that we could look at equipment acquisitions within an overall framework. Therefore, we asked for baseline data so that we could have an idea of where new acquisitions fitted with what was already in existence. I also talked last year about computer audits, technical reviews and evaluations, looking to the time when this would become a way of life within HEW.

We had as an idea that if the ADP plan had these characteristics it would become a document which could be used

throughout the year to measure actions and performance so that we would not have to have a case-by-case review of every step made in the process. And, as you know, we also worked out a division of emphasis where the Office of the Secretary would be primarily concerned with Administration and Management systems and the agencies would be delegated responsibility for effective management of programmatic systems.

I left you with this comment, "the ADP plan was long over due and we must get on with it. I did not expect perfection this year, but do your best." I directed the Office of Management Systems to work with you through the year to put this kind of a plan together and to make this kind of a process work. I even told you that I felt that it was a challenge to make this work; as we had no examples in industry or in organizations as large as HEW where it has worked, but that didn't stop us from trying.

Well, that's what we said a year ago. We have had a year and we have been through it. We've learned an awful lot and know more tonight than we knew a year ago. I think everyone that has worked in this area has also gotten a little shorter, I am not the only one. We have

looked at the comments that came in from you in the ODA report. With your help we have reviewed the plans. We talked with many of you and others, and I personally have spent long hours with the OMS staff talking about the problems of planning and problems of getting the kind of planning capability and management going in the agency level.

Here are some of the things we found. First of all the distinction between programmatic and administrative systems just doesn't work. We cannot find a workable definition and we think at this point that the use of intra or inter-agency systems may be a better approach. Next, we said we needed baseline data and we didn't get baseline data across the board from all agencies. In fact, it went from a comprehensive plan which we received from one agency to an agency which said their interpretation of the requirement was that they only send us new things and obviously they weren't doing anything new this year so there wasn't anything to send. We have a problem with baseline data. We found that the data we need for approval of inter-agency systems is exactly the same data needed at the agency level in order to do a good management job. The absence of this dats is prima facie evidence

that you are not managing the process at your level. If the information exists somewhere in your agency and you didn't send it to us, that is one thing; but looking deeper, it is our contention that it doesn't exist at your level in many cases.

We also learned about the hierarchal nature of the plan where there are various levels of detail -- obviously you do not need all of the detail within the agency, nor do we need all the detail that you need to do your job - I think we overlooked that in developing overall systems guidelines. We learned that the OS guidance document sent out was just about useless, and that guidance means more than just telling you about systems that the OS had underway. We realize now that guidance should be policy; it should explain to you those things that are of Department-wide importance, though they may not relate specifically to the development of an end-system. I am thinking of the whole area of privacy and handling of confidential information where we are developing Department policy. The guidance needs to include these types of things as well as systems OS has underway. We found many agency ADP planning offices

were not in the right organizational position relative to the level of responsibility within the agency to do the job. This is not their fault but is a problem to be addressed to the agency head. We also discovered that many Agency ADP Planning offices needed the clout of the Secretary's office, and the requirement that information be provided to the Secretary's office in order to get their job done. In other words, we found that if the Secretary's office did not ask for it to be sent to them (regardless of whether it was to be approved by them or not) that you lost an opportunity to collect this data at the agency level.

We also believe that the plan tends often not to reflect overall agency level management decisions. We found unresolved management problems in the plan; problems which we can't ask the ADP Planners to solve. In fighting between two bureaus, for example, can be solved only at the Agency head levels. This is something that we have to work on so that the plan which comes to us is indeed the Agency head's Plan and not the ADP Planners plan.

There was no common set of definitions. If you look at all of the plans you will find the format of the project definition and the overall level of detail of

the information contained in the Plan, is not consistent. We did not fully set any definitive definitions. We also learned that planning has to be comprehensive; we can't be planning for just a portion of the problem or just a portion of the ADP level in the agency. It has to be related to the overall baseline to know where you are now so you can know where you can go in the future. For example, some plans were only an inventory of the administrative and management applications (and then only partially).

The hardware and software aspects of the plan are an area we thought easily distinguishable. We learned that what we should do is systems planning, not hardware planning and not software planning. We should plan around a particular system with a particular objective and include in it both hardware and software.

As yet we lack any assurance from the documents received and from the work that we planned and spent with you of an absolute assurance that there is effective and efficient ADP management within your particular agency. Now I say this as a very sweeping comment; obviously there were various levels of success in this area within an agency and between agencies, but

we feel that we have to get a better assurance before we can delegate authority to proceed with implementation of your plan. We feel that we need to delegate that authority along with the accountability at the same time I am reluctant to delegate that authority unless I have some assurance that indeed an agency has taken this task seriously: so that we can respond to the Congress, to OMB, and to GSA on a Department-wide basis that we have indeed done all required of us to assure ourselves that the job is being done by the agencies.

I conclude my remarks tonight by saying that what we have really said is that the vehicle we developed as a result of last year's conference just won't get the job done. What we have to do here at this conference is to revise both procedures partially; not changing the philosophy of preclearance nor changing the philosophy that an approved plan lets you proceed within that plan on your own, but to define and to better layout the format and aspects of the plan. To those of you that will be in the Planning session, I look to you for advice and specific ideas on how we

can revise this vehicle to make it do the things I have just talked about.

Now I know those of you in the ADP management area have a question at this point: what do we do now? I have laid out four alternatives I felt we could proceed with at this point in time. First, we could just sign-off on the plans we have now and kid ourselves that we've done a good job of ADP planning, hoping that GSA and others never find out. That clearly is an alternative, not a very good one, but an alternative. Second, we could approve those plans which follow the specific OS systems guidelines and assume that all others were not approved and require a case-by-case review of those. The third alternative would be to throw out all the plans, forget about it this year, and then continue as we have in the past with case-by-case reviews and hope that the output of this conference will help us to decide how we are going to do this next year. The last alternative, and the one I think is the only practical consideration at this time, is to continue to work with you on the present ADP plans and move in the direction which I think we can all agree is the area that we want to move in in the future. Some agencies are almost

there. Some agencies are going to have to do an awful lot more work. I realize also that there are some very real priority needs for approval of systems that you have to move ahead on. I will recognize those and we will look to try to expedite the planning in those particular areas.

In the responsibilities I have in the Department in recommending to Dr. Brady and to the Secretary, I feel that the only thing that I can do in good conscience is to pick the last option to continue to work to make the planning process the vehicle that will assure effective and efficient management of ADP resources in the Department.

We have a lot more ideas about specific details of what it should look like and what should be in the plan. Don Humphries will share with you in that session some ideas about formats and what we mean by intra-agency systems and inter-agency systems. He will explore with you what we mean by review and approval at our level and what we mean by review and comment at our level.

I am fully aware of the fact that we have little confidence or knowledge of the particular problems in your agencies to make the kinds of decisions in programmatic systems

or intra-agency systems. I don't think that this should be our goal. If we can assure ourselves that you have asked the hard questions, based upon where you sit in the agency, then we think we have prima facie evidence that we have a planning process and that ADP is being managed internally within HEW. That is about all I really want to say tonight. I had a caucus a little while ago about whether the best thing to do is to have a question and answer session and we voted and we are not going to have one. Let me tell you that I will not be running away tomorrow; I will stay tomorrow and tomorrow night. I will be available to talk with anyone. I look forward to not only meeting those that I don't know, but also hearing the particular comments and ideas that each of you have on the particular problems of ADP planning. I welcome the opportunity to get down here and a chance to listen to your particular ideas and particular problems.

(Applause)

III. TRACK REPORTS

These summaries of the activity in each Track are individually formatted to best depict the Track, but do address the goals, issues, and recommendations germane to the subject. For a discussion of the Track Reports, refer to Section IV, Summary Session.

A. PLANNING TRACK REPORTS

1. Moderator - Donald E. Humphries, OMS
2. Goals
   (a). Review past ADP planning effort.
   (b). Analyze the Part 2 planning guidelines.
   (c). Analyze the Part planning requirements.
   (d). Develop the planning philosophy.
   (e). Develop a model planning process.
   (f). Develop the broad management concepts of planning and policy.
3. Issues
   (a). No definitions caused basic problems.
   (b). There had been no previous indication that base-line data would be required nor was "base-line" defined.

(c). The authority to levy the requirement that agencies develop detail plans was not clear.

(d). What is the overall purpose of the plan and who does it serve?

(e). What level of detail is required in the plan for:

(1). Hardware?

(2). Software?

(3). Support?

(f). What revisions are planned for the existing ADP plan process - requirements and guidelines.

4. Discussion of Track

The track moved quickly and we realized that we were dealing too much with the mechanical process of the plan rather than what a plan should be: a tool to implement a management process and style. We agreed that a plan must have a purpose, it must serve some management style and a management process, and it should aid in implementing this

process.

We found the planning vehicle was not designed to implement this process and agreed upon major changes. What we came up with a revision of the plan: a "new plan," a redefinition of the old plan and process. There is no strict correlation to what we originally worked with but what we came up with has some commonality. It is divided into three parts:

(1) Part A, which are inter-agency systems (this is the part where there is a OS approval);

(2) Part B, which are intra-agency systems (where there is an OS review and comment); and,

(3) an Appendix which provides the resources plan necessary to carry-out the first two parts.

We recognize there are difficulties in the agencies in making this work. We also recognize the tremendous amount of effort of the agencies put into submitting their original plan. The old plan has generally the necessary detail,

though not completely, to move to this new posture. What action is required next? What can we do with the current plan?

We agreed upon a course of action where OMS will work with each agency individually to do whatever is necessary to effect the compromise; between the plan submitted and the new planning process, so we can move toward a clear definition of responsibility and delegation and the new management style and process.

In summary, we recognized we are talking about management style, a tool, and a process. The plan helps it all to go. Our commitment is to assign individuals to work with an agency designated individual. This may be done by the end of November in order to get the planning process back on track; getting into the next cycle with new guidelines to reflect the entire new planning process the first of January.

5. Resolution

(a). The new planning concept requires that systems be grouped thus:

Inter-Agency - systems that require interface with other agencies or departments for the performance of the function.

Intra-Agency - systems that perform a function totally internal to that agency - does not require interface with any system outside the agency.

(b). There is a need to consolidate various regulations, especially those in procurement.

(c). OMS will make specific recommendations, revise Chapter 2, and the guidelines to reflect the management policy by January 1, 1973.

(d). OMS will meet with each Agency to resolve through negotiation what is required to change the submitted plan to reflect the new directions.

(e). The New Plan has three sections:

Part A - Inter-Agency Systems - Responsibility:

(1). OMS - approval/disapproval

(2). Agency - waits for decision

Part B - Intra-Agency Systems - Responsibility:

(1). OMS - review and comment

(2). Agency - procede as desired

Appendix - Resources

All resources to support system in Part A and Part B - resources may not necessarily relate one-to-one to Part A and B.

(f). Once the base-line is established the plan will be the vehicle for reporting change.

(g). The New Plan:

(1). defines areas of interest.

(2). defines approval authority.

(3). is in-line with OS management responsibility.

(4). is consistant with OS management policy.

(h). OMS authority has been established using OMB Circulars and GSA Regulations and Public

Law 89-306, (etc).

5. Immediate Action

(a). OMS will meet with each agency individually to bring present plan into acceptable compromise - toward the "New Plan".

(b). Target completion date is December 1, 1972.

B. TELECOMMUNICATIONS TRACK REPORT

1. Moderator - Daniel A. Lahn, OMS (Assisted by Peter Nielsen, OMS)

2. Goals

(a). Identify issues and define scope of problem.

(b). Recommend alternative courses of action best suited to establish a set of policies supporting the orderly development of teleprocessing(t/p) capabilities in the Department.

3. Issues

(a). Current facilities required by certain categories of applications for data transmission are reaching a saturation point.

(b). Transmission reliability is diminishing to a point where concern for alternative solutions is acute.

(c). Applications are increasing in complexity and require more sophisticated anf flexible transmission facilities.

(d). Top management views telecommunications and data processing as functionally separate as reflected by organizational placement.

(e). OMS coordination role too pasive in an issue area requiring immediate attention.

(f). Some agencies have identical traffic routes but are planning T/P resources independently (viz., DMC and FDA).

(g). While large volumes of data traffic can lead to cost-effective solutions to T/P problems as in the case of SSA, the unilateral approach is generally not cost-effective.

(h). Some organizations do not wish to share the cost of a T/P network: (1) traffic routes are dissimilar and could compromise or disadvantage the high volume user; (2) some applications have been developed requiring low-cost T/P support facilities and, foreseeing little change to this situation, prospects of sharing costs for an extensive T/P network have little appeal.

(i). Issues involving transmission lines and terminal devices are generally considered separately, but in fact, bear so heavily

on one another, that to consider them independently creates further confusion.

(j). Any decision to develop a T/P network would be premature if a thorough analysis of current and planned applications did not serve as a fundamental input to any decision to proceed in centralizing T/P facilities.

(k). Expertise in T/P lacking for doing an adequate job of network analysis and future planning.

4. Resolution

A Departmental problem has been identified requiring a cooperative solution with OS taking the leadership role in developing policies and recommendation to facilitate the orderly development of T/P.

5. Recommendations

Three alternative courses of action were proposed from which OS will choose:

(a). Re-charter the T/P advisory council.

(b). Expand FDA study contract to include all agencies.

(c). Utilize Federal assistance review capability to bring together the necessary expertise from DHEW and/or other Federal agencies to guide T/P development.

C. STANDARDS TRACK REPORT

1. Moderator - Robert G. Cox, OMS

2. Discussion of Track

The goals for the Standards Group must be to develop a realistic Standards Program and a plan to implement it. OMB and NBS will assist our program. An agency should develop its own standards program and OMS would review it in the plan.

The role of the standards coordinator at the Agency level was discussed. We need to broaden the base of who is involved in standardizing data and applications. It was decided that there is a need for training on how to develop standards. There was a need for leadership from OMB, OMS, NBS and DHEW Agencies and a need for standards guidelines.

The interchange of data is not the only reason for standardizing data elements: it makes the data more useful, improves operations. Standards must also be integral with systems planning and the ADP function in the organization. This is very important; standards can't be separated

from good systems planning and programming.

3. Recommendations

   (a). OMS and the agencies together will attempt to develop cross-walks between OMB circular A-86 and A-40 (and others).

   (b). OMS will take the leadership to develop better coordination between DHEW and OMB, NBS, GSA, GAO, etc.

   (c). A full-time standards officer is needed to get the job done. Support is needed to get these positions full-time in the agencies.

   (d). Definition in A-86 need to be clarified by OMB, NBS, and OMS. There is confusion over Federal and program standards.

   (e). OMB will establish objectives and priorities on what a standards program will look like in DHEW.

   (f). OMB will require a standards plan from DHEW (and all other Federal agencies) in the near future.

(g). OMS will include standards as a part of the Annual ADP Plan. This is important to give suitable emphasis to standards.

(h). OMS and the agencies will work together on policy positions for the standards program.

(i). OMS will provide a training program for agency standards officers.

(j). OMS will continue after the conference to develop objectives and plan with the help of OMB, NBS and as many of the people who participated in this conference to develop the program.

(k). The Standards most useful to the Agencies are:

(1). in the applications area,

(2). in the systems development area,

(3). information systems requirements,

(4). systems interfaces,

(5). documentation,

(6). data base,

(7). in the program development area,

(8). program languages,

(9). modular programming,

(10). documentation,

(11). testing,

(12). the Operations area,

(13). librarian procedures,

(14). operator instructions,

(15). in the systems acquisition area, and

(16). equipment and personnel

Agencies will develop their own standards plan and include it in the Annual ADP Plan. OMS will review that plan with the Agencies to determine its effectiveness.

D. PROCUREMENT/REGULATIONS TRACK REPORT

1. Moderator - Doris S. Scholze, OMS (Assisted by Daniel A. Lahn, OMS)

2. Goals

(a). Discover Problems in the Agency and OS (Session 1).

(b). Information on Relevant Regulations (Session 2).

(c). Recommendations on Changes to Department and GSA Policies and Procedures (Session 3).

3. Issues

There was agreement among the agencies that confusion concerning procurement regulations and procedures existed because there were too many rules, policies and clearance/coordination points. OMB Circular A-54 was described as a "super-club" over agencies requiring detailed procurement justification, etc., yet it was written with a whole system in mind rather than anything less. Other guidance documents referred to issued by OMB i.e., Bulletin 60-6 and Circular A-61 are out of date and do not readily apply to current problems. How does one conduct analysis called for under these issuances

written in 1960 and 1963? The major complaint evolved around the problems due to "slowness of the system to improve the rules." Compliance to procedures regarding major and minor system changes is difficult since definitions are not clear.

Larger agencies are involved in procurements where smaller organizations could ride "piggy back" if their requirements were known in advance or before the fact. There is no one place in the Department where joint procurements are coordinated.

Options available under the FPMR's are a sore point and need clarification.

There is a growing need to build rapport with GAO. In larger areas where resident staffs exist, the trend of GAO seems to lean heavily toward management type interests which present another level for coordination of procurement actions. Concerning cost effectiveness studies, GAO was quoted as prescribing the inclusion of real costs, which are not known until after the fact: the whole area of conversion allowance credits, operational conversion costs and purchase costs need clear-cut definitions

and examples as guides. Do standards apply - if so, how much is enough. There are also problems concerning validation of workload, as part of procurement justifications. In any event, agencies are left in the dark as to whether there was too much or too little effort put into their justifications and feedback in memos of approve/disapprove should be more detailed giving OMS' analyses of submissions. The same comment re feedback applies to items where agencies are required to report the need for data in areas such as recent 2068 comments and others.

Pending legislation is not considered justification for major hardware acquisition; what justification does apply in that type of procurement planning? This is not unique to any particular agency. Sole source justification needs clarification also. There are operating problems in dealing with GSA matters. For instance, ADP managers are responsible for production output but are also guinea pigs or considered "test-beds" for new, poorly tested, or "low-cost" products. Quality standards are either too low or not properly monitored by GSA (magnetic

tape was used as one example), and when referring complaints or problems to GSA, agencies feel their response is poor. Agency problems discussed led to the consensus that there is a need for exemption from burdensome GSA procurement delegations, as they exist today.

Whenever there is an absence of a GSA QPL (qualified products list), performance standards then apply which must be developed by the requirement group. This causes a problem for the small users.

Large users feel penalized as additional approvals are required on orders exceeding the maximum order limitation (MOL) in GSA's program to get quantity discounts.

Determining economic feasibility is complicated when considering the use of multiple vendors, since the additional cost of the installation for the administration of such an arrangement should be included; guidelines are not effective.

Mr. Whit Dodson of GSA discussed the recent changes in the organization of GSA. A new service was created, the Automated Data Management and Telecommunications Service. Two of the four offices

within the new service with which agencies will have the most control will be Office of Agency Assistance, Planning and Policy headed by Sid Weinstein and the Office of Automated Data Management Services, headed by Mr. Dodson.

Mr. Dodson referred to some of the complaints throughout the government in reference to Brooks Bill/ GSA requirements. He suggested that the option to use waivers be exercised. HEW management judgments should be presented in writing. He mentioned future items coming down the pike of interest to agencies:

(a). GSA's automated mailing list available for a fee.

(b). GSA will require reviewing proposals before award when only one vendor remains in competitive bidding.

(c). Sole source (FPMR) delegation required for any purchase over $10,000.

(d). ADP simulation and performance evaluation services are available from the Federal ADP Simulation Center, operates by the Air Force, see FPMR Temporary Regulation E-24, 9/26/72.

(e). GSA will be going after vendors on warranty performance, where there is a limitation on liability.

(f). Fixed term futures are receiving the attention of GSA.

(g). Late proposal clauses will be changed to indicate that late proposers will be considered only when low bidder.

(h). Third party replacement program - GSA will give the issue more attention.

(i). GSA intends to establish a means of determining "residual value."

(j). ADP Fund Policy change being made in that agencies will pay at fair market value (discounts will be passed onto agencies).

(k). Full capitalization - GSA will eventually hold full title to all equipment.

(l). Multi-Year leasing legislation requires GSA to obligate total amount for term of the lease, pending legislation will remove this requirement.

(m). GSA's basic authority included the Federal Catalog. In 1951, the cataloging program was

transferred to DOD. Mr. Dodson's group is continuing to work with the catalog people hoping to clear up ADP definition problems.

(n). GSA plans to build a milti-plex network, in addition to FTS and ARS.

(o). COBOL validation - NBS will work COBOL on standardization. DOD had taken the lead in developing COBOL validation routines. At present time, the role of GSA in procurement needs clarification. NBS will probably set up a centralized COBOL validation service.

(p). Benchmark Evaluation - NBS is undergoing a two year study project.

(q). Standards Review Enforcement - referred to as a difficult area GSA will look to NBS for leadership. The ADP standards program went to NBS by authority of the Brooks Bill.

4. Actions & Recommendations

(a). OMS needs to be a meeting ground for Systems and Procurement - words and terms must be pinned down - this must be formalized.

(b). The ADP Systems Manual, last draft of November 4, 1970, needs to be re-activated

and issued. It should be a good cross reference document of all regulating policies and procedures to all types of ADP procurements... Include Department policy relating to each type of procurement and regulation.

(c). Joint procurements (Policy and Planning) needs to be coordinated and directed.

(d). OMS should take the lead to present agency problems to GSA and get relief from burdensome procurement delegations.

(e). Establish a HEW working group, headed by OMS, to include agency OS ADP systems and procurement people, whereby they will meet on a regular structure basis to resolve common procurement issues. Where problems cannot be solved internally, this group will formulate the issues so they can be brought before, GSA, OMB, etc., to be dealt by them.

(f). Supply to agencies the documents cited by Mr. McFee in his speech to the Conference October 17, which concerns the many regulations etc., existing to which the Department had responsibility. In addition to supplying

the list, OMS should provide a narrative with each regulation, citing the impact with reference to the different issuances.

(g). Set up procedures in HEW, where relationships with GSA and OMB are controlled by OMS.

E. APPLICATIONS TRACK REPORT

1. Moderator - Wallace McPherson

Assisting - Joseph Costa

SUMMARY

A series of thirteen presentations covered such diverse areas as Grants Management System Information Effort, the Reports Statistics Program in the Department, Privacy Issues in ADP (presented by Dave Martin), Data Security (presented by Bernie Kroll from NIH), the Technical Training Programs which consisted of a presentation of the new program recently developed by the Office of Family Benefits Planning, Grants Payment System, Data Personnel System, Payroll System, Systems in the Regions, Computer Installation Security, Simulation Techniques, Clearing Houses and Productivity Measurement. I guess you could say we covered quite a spectrum of activities in our track. Our track had as it's goal information exchange. I think we have accomplished this, and have brought out many points of concern. I have identified just a few here, but am sure there are more major issues, or even issues of insignificance, that people felt should be considered

at some of these sessions. We have not intentionally ignored any issue or avoided it; we have, however, identified a few issues that are very significant from all tracks, not specifically from one track or from one presentation.

The first issue we identified was the issue of privacy and security of data in HEW. The recommendation which came from several of our sessions was that policy be established. This means that policy be established to give guidance to the agency and staff offices as to what they should do about security and privacy and how they can do it. The action recommended is that OMS should take the leadership in causing policy to be developed.

The second issue was the lack of grant contract management information in the Office of the Secretary and the Agencies. The recommendation was that a system be developed to provide the needed information. This is an ongoing activity in OMS and that really means that OMS should continue in the leadership for developing this system.

The third issue was the need for an ADP Clearing House. I understand that quite a strong recommendation

was made that the Clearing House be tied to the plan, either as input to the plan or as output from the plan. Again the action on this is that OMS should work with the Agencies to develop this program.

The next issue (and this came out of three or four sessions) was the differences and a defiency in policy for technical training. Some of the Agencies have training programs which are directed towards the improvement of a person rather than the management orientation to get better utilization of that person's skills (by developing particular aspects of the person that management needs or wants). The recommendation was for a Department-wide training program. And, again, the action is that OMS take leadership in causing the development of a training program.

The last major issue which came out again in many sessions, and quite strongly in our dinner talk is the existence of the maze of systems in our Regional Offices and the total lack of information on flow-back. The recommendation was that we need more common systems; we need more common data items; and systems which return information to the regional

offices. Action: continued work between Offices of Field Coordination with assistance from DMC, OMS, OPT, and all the other offices which have been cooperating with the Office of Field Coordination in trying to improve this situation.

IV. SUMMARY SESSION

Questions and Reactions at the Friday morning session chaired by Edward A. Diephaus.

Doris (SRS):

Will the publication of what went on the past couple of days be available to us?

Diephaus (OMS):

There will be proceedings published. We will do the best we can with session reports, track reports, the tapes and information from the speakers. They should be available two to three weeks.

Shepherd (SSA):

Will we have this before you begin your negotiations with the agencies?

Diephaus (OMS):

I am more anxious to get started with negotiations with the agencies, and reach a compromise, and get the FY 73 plans done.

Shepherd (SSA):

I would like to comment on planning. I want to record that SSA has reservations with respect to Department approval of inter-agency systems that are programmatic

or operational in nature. We will work with you on it, but we do have reservations. We don't necessarily concur that OMS should approve those kinds of systems. Also some of the intra-agency systems are support systems in nature and should be submitted for your information and for possible clearinghouse use but not necessarily for approval.

There was a question on the Regional Office functions and the need for common systems, common data items, and feedback that I didn't quite follow. Many systems are national in scope and there can be no modifications of standards for Regional purposes.

McPherson (OMS):

I don't think SSA will be actually involved in this. Don Whitaker might want to correct me, but I don't think they are. The prime example is the umbrella accounting system, where OS, HSHMA, SRS, OE; each have individual accounting systems being run by the same people in Regional Offices; yet they have different systems, different formats, different codes, etc.

Shepherd (SSA):

There seems to be some question regarding the telecommunications recommendation 4 and the three alternatives. My understanding was that these three, which I didn't quite understand, were not quite responsive to SSA position or requirements; namely expand FDA contract to include Department requirements. I don't follow what you are saying here. We have some pressing telecommunications problems which we don't feel would be solved by centralizing control of this thing at the Department.

Lahn (OMS):

This whole set of recommendations represents a solution to some of the intermediate-range problems. I think you've got a short range problem that might have to be dealt with in a different manner. I'm not sure right now. We don't have enough detail about the immediacy of your problem.

Shepherd (SSA):

We have immediate and long-range problems, we are very large users of current systems, carry a large part of the cost, and, therefore, we should have a pretty large part in the say about what happens to the system.

Lahn (OMS):

In a Departmental system you would represent something like 90% of the load, another way of saying it is that the Department would be using the SSA system.

Shepherd (SSA):

That is what I really want brought up.

O'Connor (SSA):

That was not the way it was supposed to be left. When the system was developed, and if it was transparent, met or exceeded our requirements, we would have no objections; but, the implication was not that we develop a system for the Department.

Lahn (OMS):

Certainly the maximum requirements would be included in the contract that would satisfy everyone; and, if they didn't, that individual agency that they did not satisfy should exercise their prerogative.

Shepherd (SSA):

This depends on who exercises the thought on what is going to happen. We would be concerned with the requirements that placed a high cost on the system on which we would bear a great part, and having only a small part

in the use of that particular facility or requirement.

Lahn (OMS):

Hopefully that would be worked out in one of the recommendations where this would be examined in far greater detail than we have an opportunity to here in this session.

Nielsen (OMS):

I think that it was recognized in that session that the feasibility of instituting the Department-wide telecommunications network would have to be examined in the near future because of the apparent urgency of the problems. I think that is what the three different alternatives each related to an examination of the feasibility of the whole thing because not that much communication had been flowing bwtween the agencies or between ADP planning officers in the OS until now.

Shepherd (SSA):

Standards - I think you said Bob, that you came to the conclusion that there was a need for common standards at the installation level.

Cox (OMS):

The payoff, it was said by the group, is that a standardization program developed and carried out by the agencies, particularly in the application area, could have the greatest benefit.

Unidentified:

These are not to be the Departmental standards, they are agency standards.

Shepherd (SSA):

There was a question of training in policy and technical areas and that OMS should take the lead in Department-wide training that would seem to be infeasible in certain technical aspects.

McPherson (OMS):

You missed the keyword - "in causing the development of".

Shepherd (SSA):

I think the SSA Commissioner has the responsibility in causing the appropriate training, not necessarily OMS.

McPherson (OMS):

We're not apart on this. There are agencies who do not have training programs. There are problems in knowledge

of regulations, there are problems in knowledge of policy, in knowledge of technical areas; designed primarily for ADP personnel.

Shepherd (SSA):

I gather that you saying that OMS should do some review as to what is going on in the agencies and perhaps bring their attention to the areas that apply.

McPherson (OMS):

There were several sessions from which this recommendation was derived. There were some recommendations which came from that session according to the report I received which do have some bearing on this. I have taken and added recommendations from other sessions to make one overall recommendation that training be promoted if you will. This came out in Doris' session, too.

Shepherd (SSA):

There was a recommendation that OMS should cause a policy to be established in regard to data security and other personal data involved.

McPherson (OMS):

That was a strong recommendation for several agencies...

Shepherd (SSA):

We have to recognize that some SSA data is secured by law and regulation and you cannot tamper with it.

McPherson (OMS):

We think this would be policy more intended toward answering the question of minimum security rather than maximum security.

Shepherd (SSA):

There seemed to be a general feeling on one side that we need greater standardization of ADP data and on the other side that there is a danger in this.

McPherson (OMS):

He said (Martin) that there is a need to have linkages to be developed such as use of SSN, however, the direction in which his committee is leaning at the moment is that there would be tight controls on permitting the use of the linkages.

Shepherd (SSA):

I think Martin's attitude itself seemed quite reasonable, but the mere fact that you establish by good standards and by linkage techniques the capability of linking-up

the data file, doesn't necessarily mean that you will do it, simply put yourself in a position where you can do it, but there is a general concern in Congress and in the public at large that we are doing too much of this, and on the more technical side there is concern that we are not doing enough.

McPherson (OMS):

Don't forget that Congress and Martin's committee are concerned with personal data systems which is a prime concern to you. Whereas much of our effort is directed towards such items as the accounting system, the grants management system, and systems which are a little less directed toward personal, more towards management items.

McDonough (HS):

Dan, one of your wrap up points was that centralization of teleprocessing would lead to a more effective use of this function.

Lahn (OMS):

Centralization of facility planning, and the facilities themselves, I said would assist in supporting concepts of regionalization and decentralization programs.

McDonough (HS):

You are not saying that the teleprocessing function needs to be centralized?

Lahn (OMS):

I am; where it is determined that a common facility will serve the users. In other words, if everyone has a regional network set-up and there is not a reason why we shouldn't use common lines.

McDonough (HS):

Dan indicated that centralization is not given as far as he is concerned. When hard data is available it should be used to analyze the question of centralization in the area of TP. Hard data may indicate that some centralization is warranted but then it may not. From HSMHA's stand point, the expansion of the FDA contract is not the way to go. We feel that perhaps a rechartering or continuation of the current teleprocessing advisory council is perhaps the way to go; to insure that all interests and all aspects of teleprocessing in the Department have a voice.

Lahn (OMS):

The course that we want to take is the course that is going to get us to collecting that hard data and making

an evaluation as soon as possible. And that I believe can still be any of those three.

McDonough (HS):

I think some preliminary survey work is always required before you let a contract. Simply saying, in the contract "here is $500,000; go find out and come back in six months and tell us;" is not the right way for our interest to be protected. I think some survey work should be done before closing of a contract ascertaining where should TP be going in the Department.

Lahn (OMS):

I think it may be a combination of those three; in other words, the advisory council would be the prime group to draw the specifications for any contract.

O'Connor (SSA):

I don't think anybody else had the same concern for those TP problems.

McDonough (HS):

You present your chart like it is a common problem and a lot of the discussion in that session said that it was a common problem. It is a crisis. There is

going to be this immediate swelling of TP traffic and you have got to address it within the next few months or it will be too late.

O'Connor (SSA):

I don't sense the urgency that is expressed here and I don't see any common problem.

Diephaus (OMS):

Does someone else want to react to that.

McPherson (OMS):

I think it came out in some of our application sessions that there are other areas where it is a major problem including in the Indian Health Service and the Regional Offices in some functional areas.

McDonough (HS):

The problem being expressed here is one that bothers me. In the application track we were talking about terminals: the type, whether we should have a uniform terminal, whether the terminal should have certain characteristics or not, whether there should be a single terminal in each Regional Office, etc. And in the teleprocessing track the terminals are not the problem. The problem is

the network which will support a great variety of programs. These two problems do not seem to line up, rather they are opposed as far as I can see. In other words general conclusions drawn in this very complex and broad area with many diverse inputs are probably not accurate or justified without a great deal of homework which must insure that any broad generalities do in fact apply to all applications and agencies.

Lahn (OMS):

Well, the only thing I can say (and I think it best sums it up) is that each agency will have impact on any results that affect them.

McDonough (HS):

The best way to do that is to work through the Advisory Council rather than through any contract.

Lahn (OMS):

I don't think we can go out on the street with the contract. We just don't know yet fully what the problem is.

Diephaus (OMS):

How about some more areas of reactions? How about questions you have written down?

Unidentified:

Do we propose turning the Bureau of Indian Services and their TP network into this?

McDonough (HS):

Standards will be part of the ADP Plan.. Will you indicate which part? Where?

Cox (OMS):

The important thing is developing a plan to include a Standards response somewhere in the plan.

Diephaus (OMS):

It may be important to think about Standards in the planning process more than in the product that you deliver once a year. In other words, Standards is involved in the planning process - how it shows up as a piece of paper in the Plan itself (whether it's Appendix S or not) I don't think is important equally. The important point is that is is in the process.

DeTimmerman (OE):

Each agency has to evolve Standards for its internal operation. Obviously it is a standardization of the systems development process, in terms of the requirements

for the way in which they process and operate - and improvement in the process that is in the agency and the documentation of that process. Much of that becomes input into the ADP plan. Now, as far as the development of methods Standards and/or performance standards, those independently can be a part of the objectives of the agency, with proper delineation, and can be carried in the ADP Plan independently of Filleman's (OE) proposals since they are really management proposals.

Diephaus (OMS):

No more reactions? questions?

CLOSING STATEMENT BY MR. DIEPHAUS:

I would like for you to observe that we used this conference operation as a model of how we view OMS operating. It doesn't mean that I'm going to spend the next year worrying about your lodgings, but more how we operated as a team carrying out the conference itself. I want you to think about the model and the conference operation together with Tom McFee's remarks.

The OMS role should now be clear. The role came up most frequently in the interview data the ODA consultants got from you and others. Let me state it in a few words.

I think we have established that there is a regulatory base involved and OMS is acting as an agent of the Secretary carrying-out that regulatory responsibility. The conference, like OMS' operation, depends heavily on agency participation for the identification of issues and suggestions for alternative solutions to those issues. It's a way of operating. The approach we use to carry-out our mission is to emphasize ADP planning and the ADP plan. That is the focus or keystone. Planning should have come across at this conference as it has in the past four conferences. Everything we do in the inter-

action with you and between agencies has to do with good ADP Planning.

As has been said several times, what is involved here is nothing more than a concept of management. We are going to get intensely involved in the approval and disapproval of inter-agency systems, as defined. We are going to want to review and be aware of agency decisions on intra-systems (the ones you decide to do). We want that primarily as evidence of good management of ADP in an agency. And we want some review and awareness of your ADP resources. We don't have perfect lists of all of these, we don't have perfect definitions, but I think we have workable definitions now.

I think you should reflect on what this means to you. The way I see it, we are delegating almost everything that OMS ever did to you. It turns out that you are masters of your own resources. You really are now if we put the "New Plan" into operation.

It means something to us, too. It basically means we do our job if you do your job. It's that simple. Our job, again, has this regulatory background for carrying-out

an ADP program with effective and efficient utilization of these resources. It is public policy, law; it is the things we have to do. It means something else to us, too. It is one that will take some time to develop. We will have to come out with more comprehensive guidelines, more responsive guidelines, not just the "guidance document" of last year of the OS Staff Systems that were going to impact on you. It means that information systems at the Secretary's level (inter-agency systems) are the keystone of planning as far as we are concerned. That is where we are going to be intensely involved.

It means other things, too. It means we must provide you some guidelines on procurement policy, an issue identified at this session. We are going to provide you with some trends and directions. The privacy issue is another example; you'll need to do some planning here and it has to come from the Office of the Secretary. Telecommunications policy is another. The guidelines are how standards gets worked into the ADP Plan and the planning process. It means other things that we have

discussed at other conferences.

One that comes to mind is Data Center concepts. The old regulations were written in the first and second generation computer business and may be out-of-date or meaningless. We tried unsuccessfully a year and a half ago to come up with some approach on Data Centers. We have a responsibility to write guidelines; something like - "there shouldn't be any organization restrictions - use any Data Center in HEW." Why do we have these artificial constraints? Let us examine that issue and provide guidelines to you.

What is involved here is leadership; a trite word, perhaps but that is what I see here. It is leadership on a strategic level as opposed to the tactical level. I over-heard a social hour conversation describing how the agencies are out on the battlefield fighting the fights and OMS is sitting-in some safe command center. This is true and I think that we should act like that and I think we can. The battles are going on and we must direct the war as we see the Secretary wanting that war directed.

It is also appropriate to note that this conference is a kick-off. We have only begun to work. I guess that is true of other conferences to a certain extent. I think we have come a long way in this one and it's going to go on. Look at the track reports and you can see that it was a kick-off. It isn't going to end when you leave here. A lot of identification of who has the ball on that issue, on that problem, (etc) has been made.

In that sense I think the conference was a success and these are the reasons why: (1) I think OMS' role was clarified at this session to the agencies and to ourselves. (2) We have had agency participation and OMS staff office participation in identifying issues and coming up with suggested solutions to them - we set out to do that. (3) We have established ADP Planning is the approach to achieving the agency mission and OS mission simultaneously. We have a lot of mechanical problems to work out, but I think we have established that.

The data from the "reactionnaires" you filled-out at the end of every other session shows your grading of the conference was "B+++++" but not quite "A----". That hurt a little bit. We really seemed to have put the conference together to focus on the issues you identified for the agenda. The leadership role played by the OMS moderators in these sessions rated an A or B. There was participation and there was progress to resolution to some issues. My other observation is that communications were improved. Finally, unlike previous conferences, I think we have a process now in being. The ODA people suggested a process of follow-up; proceedings are one step. I don't think we have solved all of the problems here.

I don't think we have identified all of the problems but have identified that we do have problems. I remember at one of the very testy points in my life, I was very upset about a lot of problems. A wise old Administrative Officer I worked for (now retired) said if you didn't problems you wouldn't have a job. I think we have to operate in that vein.

That is my assessment of what has happened, I am looking forward to getting these conference assessments so I can hear how you felt about the conference.

(Whereupon the conference closed).

V. CONFERENCE ASSESSMENT

27 responses were turned in by the participants on Friday morning.

Ia - What expectations were met - and how?

11 a. interpersonal information exchange; problem updating, ideas, etc.

7 b. insight to OMS, GSA, OMB, etc.

6 c. presentations were informative

4 d. ADP planning process made valuable

e. none

f. all

g. telecommunications discussion

Ib - Which of your expectations were not met - why not?

5 a. OMS leadership display: ADP systems planning, T/C-P, standards, etc.

3 b. resolution of problems identified

3 c. some; not enough expertise or time available

2 d. OMB, GSA and OMS interplay not described

2 e. none

2 f. no policy statements

2 g. OMS role

h. agency activities presentation

i. uniform system of procedures in ADP

j. statement of problems

k. responsibility for T/P - T/C.

l. FY 73 ADP Plans not discussed specifically

m. planning guidelines not stated

Ic - Of the unmet expectations, which ones should OMS follow up?

11 a. leadership by OMS (on a number of problems), exert responsibilities

8 b. develop policy

4 c. TP/TC policy development by OMS

3 d. uniform procedures for systems review (SOP)

3 e. clearinghouse establishment

3 f. increase OMS staff

3 g. standards program

h. info on purpose of the ADP Plan

3 i. follow-up on ADP Plan; also on Conference recommendations in general

j. legislation on privacy

k. OMS get tough with OMB, GSA, GAO, et al

l. downtown DC ADP policy change

2 m. get out planning guidelines

n. none

o. all

p. assign OMS staff by name to agency and problem areas

q. OMS Newsletter

r. proceedings published

s. earlier Agenda development

Id - Who is responsible for the others (identify specificially)

2 a. department/agency approach to all problems, joint activity to OMS lead

b. ASAM should back-up OMS

c. OS policy level involvement

d. OPT for PDS improvement

e. none

f. all TP/TC people for T/C network

g. next conference: Agency inputs formalized

IIa - Overall facility - What should change - be specific

11 a. OK, no change, perfect, just right

5 b. earlier in Fall

4 c. no opinion

2 d. depends on where held

e. warm period of year

f. 2-4 weeks before ADP Plan due (maybe separate) pre-conference

g. twice a year

IIa2 - Facility

ACCOMMODATIONS		FOOD		MEETING ROOMS		OTHER	
9	poor, lousy	11	Excellent	12	Adequate	1	Bath crowded
7	OK, good	9	Mediocre, OK	7	Outstanding	1	Too primitive
6	more hotel-like	7	Good	1	Too cold	1	Location (excellent (no time to enjoy)
	too remote		Bad			1	Good effort, OMS
							More evening socials
							Well organized should be continued
							Use P.A. system

II3 - Pre-conference planning technique

9 a. need earlier agenda distribution; detailed issue papers too

6 b. adequate, good, OK

2 c. more Agency inputs

2 d. excellent

1 e. more applications emphasis, especially by Agencies

1 f. too many tracks; confusing

g. could not detect any

h. poor

II4 - Other changes

a. no outside communications available

b. more data standard emphasis

c. applications poll before agenda finalized

d. use evenings for work

e. all housed together

f. no dinner speeches

g. no agency gripes

VI. ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS

NAME	AGENCY
Bainbridge, Ross	FDA
Baker, Carl	DMC
Barber, Albert M.	HS
Bearden, Gary	SSA
Beveridge, Robert E.	SSA
Blythe, Kenneth C.	HS
Brackett, Joe	NIH
Buzza, Edward P.	SSA
Campbell, Frank J.	OS
Costa, Joseph F.	OS
Cox, Robert G.	OS
Darden, Annie B.	OS
DeTimmerman, Louis J.	OE
Diephaus, Edward A.	OS
Doris, Allan P.	SRS
Fhat, Donald M.	ODA
Elsner, Kenneth A.	NIH
Filleman, Spence	OE
Fuller, Robert	OS
Gable, Diane	NIH
Gall, Donald	NIH

NAME	AGENCY
Gargano, Mike	HS
Giammo, Thomas	DMC
Goldrick, Robert	SSA
Gooch, Ralph	--
Hirshenberger, Herbert	SRS
Hoff, George	NIH
Hughes, Gene	NIH
Humphries, Donald	OS
Johnson, Harold	HS
Juenemann, Henry	NIH
Kluckowski, Stan	SSA
Kroll, Bernard	NIH
Lahn, Daniel	OS
Leifer, Lee	HS
Leslie, Laura	DMC
Martin, David	OS
Mason, Bob	DMC
McDonald, Linda	DMC
McFee, Thomas	OS
McPherson, Wallace	OS
Mitchell, Bryan	OS

NAME	AGENCY
Moog, William	SSA
Muscar, Jake	OS
Newhouse, Carroll	OS
Nielsen, Peter	OS
O'Connor, John	SSA
Petersohn, Hank	OS
Philbrook, Bob	OFBP
Pospahala, John	Region VI
Pritchard, Thomas	OE
Salasin, John	OS
Saxon, George	SRS
Scholze, Doris	OS
Schuck, Dick	SSA
Schwartz, Seymour	OS
Shepherd, Dick	SSA
Smith, Ed	HS
Spiegler, Donna	OS
Swann, Ralph	FDA
Thomas, Kenneth	OS
Trimble, Bud	ODA
Tyler, Pat	OS
Vermilyea, Kermit	OFBP

NAME	AGENCY
Walden, John	NIH
Walters, Bob	HS
White, Harry	NBS
White, Ken	NIH
White, Dick	OS
Whitteaker, Don	Region VI

APPENDIX: AGENDA SUMMARY

ADP CONFERENCE
Coolfont, Berkeley Springs, West Virginia

Tuesday, October 17

3:30 p.m.	*Registration - Meadow House*
5:00	*Social Hour*
6:00	*Dinner*
7:00	*Welcome - Mr. Thomas S. McFee* *Deputy Assistant Secretary for* *Management Planning and* *Technology*
	Role of OMS - Mr. Edward A. Diephaus, Director *Office of Management Systems*
	Overview of the Conference - Dr. Donald M. Ehat *President, ODA*

TRACK 1: ADP PLANNING

OMS Moderator: Don Humphries

Wednesday, October 18

8:30	Session 1:	Past Efforts - Planning Guidelines
		- What went wrong?
		- What went right?
10:00	BREAK	
10:30	Session 2:	Past Efforts - Data-Gathering
		- Difficulties
		- Agency experiences
12:00 Noon	LUNCH	
1:30 p.m.	Session 3:	Next Cycle - The Planner's Role
		- Individual agency presentations
		- Who can use the Plan
		- Impact of ADP planning in agencies
3:00	BREAK	
3:30	Session 4:	Next Cycle - Review and Evaluation
		- Relationship to ADP Plan
		- Examples and discussion
5:00	SOCIAL	
6:00	DINNER	

Thursday, October 19

8:30 a.m.	*Session 5:*	*Organizing ADP Planning* - *Involving whole agency* - *Data: budget, program, procurement, etc.*
10:00	*BREAK*	
10:30	*Session 6:* *Chairman:*	*Model ADP Plan* *Hank Juenemann, NIH* - *Elements* - *Format* - *Data inter-linking tasks* - *DHEW guidelines*
12:00 Noon	*LUNCH*	
1:30 p.m.	*Session 7:* *Chairman:*	*Model ADP Planning Process* *Hank Juenemann, NIH* - *Organizations* - *Personnel skills needed* - *Flow of plan in agency* - *DHEW guidelines*
3:00	*BREAK*	
3:30	*Session 8:*	*Summary and Conclusions* *Recommendations for* *1. improving guidelines* *2. model ADP planning process* *3. model ADP plan*
5:00	*SOCIAL*	
6:00	*DINNER*	

TRACK 2: TELECOMMUNICATIONS

OMS Moderator: Dan Lahn
OMS Assistant Moderator: Peter Nielsen

Wednesday, October 18

8:30 a.m.	*Session 1:*	*Inventory of Activities*
	Chairman:	*Tom Giammo, OS*
		- What exists now?
		- Major efforts underway and planned
10:00	*BREAK*	
10:30	*Session 2:*	*Policy Concerns*
	Chairman:	*Frank Campbell, OS*
		- Identifying areas
		- Examine all levels
12:00 Noon	*LUNCH*	
1:30 p.m.	*Session 3:*	*"INFONET - GSA"*
	Chairman:	*Representative from Computer Sciences Corporation*
		- Scope
		- Requirements
		- Potential
3:00	*BREAK*	
3:30	*Session 4:*	*Future Directions*
	Chairman:	*Ross Bainbridge, FDA*
		- Task activities for next year
		- Summarize problems
5:00	*SOCIAL*	
6:00	*DINNER*	

TRACK 3: STANDARDS

OMS Moderator: Bob Cox

Wednesday, October 18

8:30 a.m.	*Session 1:*	*Objectives of Standardization*
		- *OMB - T. Parker*
		- *NBS - H. White*
		- *DHEW - B. Cox*
		- *DHEW Agencies - G. Bearden*
10:00	*BREAK*	
10:30	*Session 2:*	*Are Objectives Realistic?*
		- *What policy improvements can be made in OMB, NBS, DHEW?*
		- *What problems need to be resolved?*
12:00 Noon	*LUNCH*	
1:30 p.m.	*Session 3:*	*A Plan for a Realistic Program*
		- *Design step-by-step plan*
		- *Define roles of OMB, NBS, DHEW, and agencies*
3:00	*BREAK*	
3:30	*Session 4:*	*How Do We Continue After the Conference?*
		- *Who, How, What, Where, When?*
5:00	*SOCIAL*	
6:00	*DINNER*	

TRACK 4: PROCUREMENT/REGULATIONS

OMS Moderator: Doris Scholze

Thursday, October 19

8:30 a.m.	*Session 1:*	*Agency Problems*
	Chairman:	*Bill Moog, SSA*
		- Discover agency and OS concerns
		- Basic orientation
10:00	*BREAK*	
10:30	*Session 2:*	*DHEW Rules*
	Chairman:	*John Tobin, OS*
		- Rules
		- Procedures
		- Problem areas
12:00 Noon	*LUNCH*	
1:30 p.m.	*Session 3:*	*GSA Rules and ADP*
	Chairman:	*G.W. Dodson, GSA*
		- Re-organization
		- Rules and procedures
		- Future policy trends
3:00	*BREAK*	
3:30	*Session 4:*	*Suggestions for the Future*
		- Procedural recommendations
		- Task activities for next year
5:00	*SOCIAL*	
6:00	*DINNER*	

TRACKS: APPLICATIONS

OMS Moderator: Wally McPherson
Asst. Moderator: Joe Costa

Wednesday, October 18

8:30 a.m.	*Session 1:*	*Grants MIS Plans*
	Speaker:	*Thomas S. McFee, OS*
10:00	*BREAK*	
10:30	*Session 2:*	*Reports and Statistics in DHEW*
	Speaker:	*Richard Simonson, OS*
12:00 Noon	*LUNCH*	
1:30 p.m.	*Session 3:*	*Privacy Issues and ADP*
	Speaker:	*David B. H. Martin, OS*
3:00	*BREAK*	
3:30	*Session 4:*	*Data Security Considerations*
	Speaker:	*Bernard Kroll, NIH*
5:00	*SOCIAL*	
6:00	*DINNER*	

Thursday, October 19

8:30 a.m.	*Session 5A:*	*Technical Training Programs*
	Speaker:	*Ben Winslow, OFBP*
10:00	*BREAK*	
10:30	*Session 6A:*	*GPS as Related to DHEW Accounting*
	Speaker:	*John Campbell, NIH*
12:00 Noon	*LUNCH*	
1:30 p.m.	*Session 7A:*	*Personnel Data System*
	Speaker:	*William Russell, OS*
3:00	*BREAK*	
3:30	*Session 8A:*	*Payroll Systems Plans*
	Speaker:	*Henry Juenemann, NIH*
5:00	*SOCIAL*	
6:00	*DINNER*	

Thursday, October 19

8:30 a.m.	*Session 5B:*	*Computer Installation Security*
	Speaker:	*Ralph E. Gooch, Consultant*
10:00	*BREAK*	
10:30	*Session 6B:*	*Simulation Techniques*
	Speaker:	*George Pan, Consultant*
12:00 Noon	*LUNCH*	
1:30 p.m.	*Session 7B:*	*Clearinghouses in DHEW*
	Speaker:	*Peter Nielsen, OS*
3:00	*BREAK*	
3:30	*Session 8B:*	*Productivity Measurement*
	Speaker:	*Paul Benoit, Consultant*
5:00	*SOCIAL*	
6:00	*DINNER*	

Friday, October 20

7:30 a.m.	*BREAKFAST*
8:30	*A Look at Progress Reports from Tracks*
	- What needs to be done?
	- Task forces to do it?
10:00	*BREAK*
10:30	*Summary and Evaluation*
	Summary Statement
12:00 Noon	*LUNCH*
1:00 p.m.	*CLOSE*